

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 311

HE 023 501

AUTHOR Webster, David S.; And Others
TITLE Continuity and Change in the Highest-Ranked
Ph.D.-Granting Departments of English, 1925-1982.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association (Boston,
MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Doctoral Programs; *Educational Quality; Educational
Trends; *English Departments; Higher Education;
*Private Colleges; Public Colleges; State
Universities; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The study analyzed the six reputational rankings of Ph.D-granting English departments that have been published since 1925. The major finding was that most of the highest-ranked departments have been at private universities despite the fact that almost two-thirds of degree-granting departments are located at public institutions. In addition, of the highly ranked English departments that ranked higher than their overall universities, most are private. Of those highly ranked English departments that ranked lower than their overall universities, all are public. There has been great stability since 1925 in the highest ranked English departments, with few departments entering or leaving the group. Tables provide the various rankings. Contains 29 references. (DB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED319311

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN THE HIGHEST-RANKED PH.D. -
GRANTING DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH, 1925-1982

by

David S. Webster
Oklahoma State University

Georgia Sturch Bradford
Oklahoma State University

and

Craig Schneider
Brigham Young University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David S.
Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Presented at the American Educational Research Association,
Boston, Massachusetts, April, 1990.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Since 1925, six reputational rankings of Ph.D.-granting English departments have been published. Though almost two-thirds of such departments are located at public institutions, most of the highest-ranked departments throughout these years have been at private universities. In addition, of those highly ranked English departments, in the most recent (1982) ranking, that ranked higher than their universities, overall, most are private; of those highly ranked English departments that ranked lower than their universities, overall, all are public. There has been great stability since 1925 in the highest ranked English departments, with few departments entering or leaving this group.

Since 1925, six reputational rankings of Ph.D.-granting departments of English have been published -- those by Hughes (1925), Keniston (1959), Cartter (1966), Roose & Andersen (1970), Ladd & Lipset (in Scully, 1979),¹ and Jones, Lindzey, & Coggeshall for the National Academy of Sciences, hereafter referred to as NAS (1982).² One of these rankings was based on the department's overall reputation for graduate work (Hughes, 1925). A second was based on the departments that have the most "distinguished" faculties, without "distinguished" being defined (Ladd & Lipset in Scully, 1979). The other four (Keniston, 1959; Cartter, 1966; Roose & Andersen, 1970; and NAS, 1982) ranked Ph.D.-granting departments by two or more criteria, one of which, in all four rankings, was the faculty's scholarly competence. This article examines the results of these rankings, 1925-1982, paying particular attention to the earliest (Hughes, 1925) and most recent (NAS, 1982) of them. It examines, among other matters, which English departments, rated at or near the top in 1925, have declined sharply, as measured by reputational rankings, over the years; which departments, in 1925 and again in 1982, have ranked considerably higher or lower than their institutions, overall; and which departments have, on average, ranked highest, 1925-1982.

In several other disciplines, a great many academic quality rankings have been published during the 20th century. Such rankings are especially numerous in some of the social sciences, especially sociology, psychology, and economics, and a few of the major fields of graduate professional study, especially

business. For some disciplines in which many academic quality rankings have been published -- and even other fields, such as geography, law, and library science, in which relatively few rankings have been done -- analyses of the results of these rankings have been published.³ No such analysis has ever been published, however, of the rankings of English departments.

HUGHES' RANKING (1925)

In his rankings of English departments, Hughes (pp. 17-18) recorded how many first, second, third, and fourth and fifth place ratings his judges had given these departments and how many points a ranking at each position was "worth," but he did not do the arithmetic necessary to obtain departmental scores. We did the needed calculations and have listed what would have been his 17 highest-ranked English departments below in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 AROUND HERE

Next, we calculated departmental rankings for each of the 20 fields of study Hughes covered and aggregated the rankings for each field to obtain institution-wide scores.⁴ The nation's very highest-ranked English departments were overwhelmingly at private institutions. Hughes' nine highest-ranked departments and ten of his top twelve were at such institutions, although among his highest-ranked institutions, overall, only six of the top nine and eight of the top twelve were private. At four of Hughes' seventeen highest-ranked English departments, the department's

ranking was three or more positions higher than the rank order of the institution as a whole. These departments are shown below in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 AROUND HERE

Three of the four (75%) English departments whose ordinal position was three or more places higher than their institution, overall, were at private institutions, even though of Hughes' 17 highest-ranked English departments, only ten (59%) were at private institutions.

Of Hughes' 17 highest-ranked English departments, four of them ranked three or more ordinal positions lower than their institution as a whole. These departments are shown below in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 AROUND HERE

Whereas three of the four institutions whose English department ranked three or more ordinal positions above their institution as a whole were private, three of the four institutions where the English department ranked three or more ordinal positions below their institution as a whole -- including the three scoring furthest below their institution -- were public.

THE NAS RANKING (1982)

The NAS ranking (1982) rated 106 English departments⁵ according to each of twelve criteria. Of the twelve, the one referred to most often in this article is measure 08, the "scholarly quality of program faculty" (Jones, Lindzey, & Coggeshall [ed.], 1982, p. 17) because it is the one that is most similar to the criterion used by those rankings -- Hughes (1925) and Ladd & Lipset (in Scully, 1979) -- that employed only one criterion. The NAS published its report in deliberately obfuscatory form, listing departments in all the disciplines it covered in alphabetical order -- from Adelphi to Yale, or whatever -- and not, as would have been necessary for readers to make sense out of the data, in descending order of excellence. For each criterion it employed, the NAS did, however, publish the department's standard score. The mean standard score was 50, and the standard deviation was 10. Thus a department with a standard score of 60 scored one standard deviation above the mean, and a department with a standard score of 70 scored two standard deviations above it. The Graduate School of Pennsylvania State University's main campus in University Park, Pennsylvania (hereafter referred to as Penn State) has compiled a very useful print-out that makes the NAS' results comprehensible. It lists, for all 32 disciplines included in the NAS study, the departments that ranked from highest to lowest on each criterion. It shows each department's ranking both for its mean score on the NAS' 5-point scale and for its standard score. In this article, in reporting the results of the NAS ranking, we rely on Penn State's

print-out. The 25 highest-ranking English departments and their standard scores for "scholarly quality of program faculty" are shown below in Table 4.

INSERT TABLE 4 AROUND HERE

The Penn State print-out provides standard scores not only for each department the NAS ranked but also for institutions, as a whole, on measure 08, "scholarly quality of program faculty." This information makes it possible to compare English departments' standard scores with those of their institutions, overall. Of the 25 highest-ranked English departments on "scholarly quality of program faculty," twelve of them had standard scores five places (or .5 standard deviations) or more above the standard scores of their institution. These departments are listed below in Table 5.

INSERT TABLE 5 AROUND HERE

Of the six English departments among the NAS' top 25 that most outscored their institution, four of them -- the University of Virginia, Rutgers -- the State University of New Jersey (New Brunswick), the State University of New York at Buffalo, and the City University of New York Graduate School -- had not been ranked by Hughes among the top 17 English departments in 1925.

Although twelve English departments of the NAS' top 25 ranked five or more standard scores above their institution, only

three of the top 25 English departments ranked lower than their institution as a whole in standard scores, all of them by very small amounts: the University of Illinois (two standard scores), and the University of Michigan and the University of Wisconsin (both one standard score).

Of the twelve highly ranked English departments in the NAS ranking that scored five or more standard scores above their university, seven are at private institutions. Of the three English departments that scored below their university in standard scores, all three are at public institutions.

In the NAS rating, English department rankings correlate very highly -- at .89 (Astin, 1985, p. 28) -- with overall institutional rankings. Of the 32 disciplines covered by the NAS, only the rankings of mathematics (.91), physics (.91), and zoology (.90) correlate more highly with overall institutional rankings; political science ties English with a correlation of .89.

That English departments' rankings according to scholarly quality of faculty correlate so highly with overall institutional rankings is almost certainly related to the fact that English departments have large faculties. The mean size of the English departments in the NAS study was 31 full-time, ladder rank professors "who participated significantly in doctoral education" (NAS, p. 19). All five disciplines whose departments' ratings for scholarly quality of faculty correlate most highly with institutional ratings rank in the top twelve, out of the 32 disciplines covered by the NAS, in faculty size. They are,

besides English, mathematics (tied for first), physics (5th), political science (tied for 8th), and zoology (tied for 11th).

Of the disciplines whose departments' rankings for faculty scholarly competence correlate the lowest with institution-wide totals, all have smaller faculties than do zoology departments. They are physiology (tied for 16th), linguistics (tied for 23rd), geography (25th), and art history (tied for 26th). Thus the five disciplines with the highest correlations between departmental rankings and overall institutional rank all have departments with considerably more faculty members, on the average, than the four disciplines with the lowest correlations between departmental ranking and overall institutional rank.

One clear finding of the NAS ranking is the dominance of Yale's English department, both compared to other departments at Yale and to English departments elsewhere. It is the highest-ranked English department in the United States and one of only four of Yale's departments which ranks first in its discipline. (The others are French, history, and political science.) It scored 5.91, with the highest possible score being 6.00, for its faculty's scholarly quality,⁶ the highest score of any department at Yale, tied with Harvard's classics department for the highest score earned by a department in the humanities at any university, and tied with four other departments for the eighth highest mean score of the 2699 programs that the NAS evaluated. Since there is a well-known, frequently observed correlation between a department's reputational ranking and its faculty size,⁷ Yale's English department is remarkable in achieving this score because

it has only 31 faculty members, the mean faculty size of the English departments the NAS ranked.

Johns Hopkins' English department, too, scored very well in faculty reputation for scholarly quality. Its standard score tied it for the seventh highest-ranking English department, overall, and it was the second highest-ranked, by ordinal position, of all Johns Hopkins' departments. Only Johns Hopkins' microbiology department, which was rated fourth, ranks higher than does its English department, despite the fact that the English department faculty, with nine members, tied for last in faculty size of the 106 English departments ranked. Johns Hopkins as an institution fell sharply from seventh in the Hughes ranking to tied for 30th in the NAS ranking (Webster, 1983a, p. 23, Table 11). Its English department, however, improved from eighth to tied for seventh in standard scores.

THE HIGHEST-RANKED ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS, 1925-1982

It has often been observed (Jencks and Riesman, 1977, pp. 13; 403); Astin, 1985, p. 27; Trow, 1984, p. 133; Webster, 1986a, p. 14) that the highest-ranked institutions' positions in reputational rankings have remained very stable over the years. There has also been remarkable stability in the rankings of leading Ph.D.-granting English departments. Of the 17 departments ranked highest by Hughes, 16 of them, all except Bryn Mawr College, rank among the top 26 plus ties in standard scores in the NAS ranking; eleven of Hughes' top 17 schools are ranked in the top 16 by NAS.

Despite the general stability in the rankings of English departments, a few declined greatly in reputation from 1925 to 1982. Of those ranked in the top 17 by Hughes, five declined six positions or more in the NAS rankings. Bryn Mawr's department declined 76 positions, from 7th in 1925 to tied for 83rd in 1982, far more than did any other English department. The English departments whose rankings declined the most, 1925-1982, are shown below in Table 6.

INSERT TABLE 6 AROUND HERE

Of the five English departments whose reputations declined six or more places, 1925-1982, four (80%) are at public institutions, even though, of the 17 English departments Hughes ranked highest, only seven (41%) -- Illinois, North Carolina, Wisconsin, California (Berkeley), Michigan, Iowa, and Texas -- were at public institutions. So of the English departments in Hughes' highest-ranked 17 that were at public institutions, four (57%) declined six places or more by 1982, compared to only one of the ten (10%) at private universities that did.

While five departments declined by six ordinal positions or more from Hughes' (1925) to NAS (1982), only a few of Hughes' highest-ranked English departments improved their scores. The reason why more of them did not improve is due, no doubt, in part to the ceiling effect, since these departments, being very highly ranked to begin with, did not have many positions above them to which they could ascend. The only one of Hughes' 17 highest-

ranked English departments to improve its ordinal position, 1925-1982, by more than two places was the University of California at Berkeley, which rose from 14th to second.

How did those English departments ranked considerably higher and lower than their institution in 1925 compare with their institution in 1982? For institution-wide rankings for 1925, we use Webster's calculations, described above, of what would have been, had he performed the necessary calculations, Hughes' departmental and institution-wide scores. Up to now, in comparing English department rankings between 1925 and 1982, we have compared their ordinal positions. In calculating institution-wide rankings we cannot, however, use ordinal positions in any meaningful way, because if an institution had programs ranked in a few or even one of the 32 disciplines the NAS covered, Penn State's print-out ranks the entire institution based on the performance of these few programs. For example, it ranks the University of California at San Francisco as the 11th best institution, overall, based on its very high mean ratings in exactly three programs -- those in physiology, biochemistry, and microbiology. Similarly, Columbia Teachers College ties as the 39th best institution, entirely on the basis of its program in one field -- psychology -- and the Juilliard School, a school of the performing arts in New York City, ranks as the 44th best institution, based entirely on the mean score of its program in music.

More than 30 of the 224 institutions whose programs the NAS ranked are not in any sense universities. Some are medical

schools and health science centers that are affiliated with a university but whose campuses are geographically removed from it, such as Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, the Cornell University Medical Center in New York City, and the University of Texas' Health Science Center in San Antonio. Others are institutions whose curricula are much narrower than those of universities, such as Hahnemann Medical College (Philadelphia, PA), ranked entirely on the basis of its microbiology program; the Fuller Theological Seminary (Pasadena, CA), ranked entirely on the basis of its psychology program; and the Institute of Paper Chemistry (Appleton, WI), ranked entirely on the basis of its chemistry program. The effect of all these institutions which are by no means universities being interspersed throughout the Penn State print-out is that all universities except the very highest-rated ones rank lower than they otherwise would. This problem affects the rankings only of institutions, not of English departments. In NAS' rankings for the discipline of English, only English departments and not medical schools, schools of education, and theological seminaries are included. Still, no valid comparisons could be drawn if ordinal positions for English departments but not for institutions as a whole were used. Therefore, in discussing the NAS rankings, we will use standard scores for both English departments and for institutions as a whole.

Of the four English departments ranked at least three ordinal positions above their overall institution in 1925 -- Bryn Mawr, Cornell, Pennsylvania, and Stanford -- by 1982, Cornell and

Pennsylvania still had English departments substantially better than their institution, by five and four standard scores, respectively; Stanford's English department and Stanford as a whole tied in standard score. In the case of Bryn Mawr's English department, however, which had ranked ten ordinal positions better than Bryn Mawr as a whole in 1925, by 1982 it ranked beneath the institution in standard score, 45 to 41.

The sharp decline in rankings for the English department at Bryn Mawr from 1925 to 1982 is especially noteworthy because none of Bryn Mawr's other departments in the humanities declined nearly that much during those years. Besides English, which declined 76 ordinal positions, Bryn Mawr had four other humanities departments ranked in both 1925 and 1982. Of these, French fell 18 positions, from tied for 11th to 29th; German fell 29 positions, from tied for 10th to 39th; and philosophy fell 53 positions, from 13th to 66th. Classics at Bryn Mawr actually improved its ranking, from 12th to eighth.

In the case of the four English departments that were ranked three or more ordinal positions below their institution in 1925 -- Wisconsin, Michigan, California (Berkeley), and Chicago -- two of them, Wisconsin and Michigan, were still ranked worse than their institution in 1982, although by only one standard score each. Chicago's and California (Berkeley's) English departments, however, by 1982 ranked substantially higher than their institutions as a whole, by, respectively, five and four standard scores.

In 1925, the highest-ranked English departments -- all of

the top nine and ten of the top twelve -- were in private institutions. The highest-ranked institutions, overall, were less likely to be private; only seven of the top ten and eight of the top twelve were private. In 1982, the situation was much the same. Seven of the nine highest-ranked English departments in faculty reputation for scholarly quality were at private universities; however, only six of the ten highest-ranked universities, overall, according to faculty reputation for scholarly quality (Webster, 1983b, p. 18, Table 3) were private.

Until now, comparisons have been made between the results of the earliest ranking of Ph.D.-granting departments in English and the most recent one. Actually, as mentioned above, six such rankings have been made. Except for the NAS ranking, which included 106 English departments, they have ranked from 11 (Ladd & Lipset in Scully, 1979) to 29 (Roose & Andersen, 1970) English departments. Table 7, below, shows all the English departments ranked in five of these ratings; for the sixth, by the NAS, only the 25 highest-ranked English departments are shown.

INSERT TABLE 7 AROUND HERE

We calculated the English departments that had the highest average ordinal positions, 1925-1982, in five of the six rankings that are displayed in Table 7.⁸ (The one by Ladd & Lipset was omitted because it ranked substantially fewer departments than did the others.) Averaging their ordinal positions in the five rankings, the ten highest-ranked English departments, 1925-1982,

are shown below in Table 8.

INSERT TABLE 8 AROUND HERE

Eight of these departments, all except those at the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Wisconsin, are in private universities. Once again, the dominance of private institutions as the home of the top-ranked English departments is shown. In the discipline of geography, for example, the situation is very different. Ph.D.-granting geography departments have been ranked in five of the six multidisciplinary reputational rankings shown in Table 7, all but the one by Ladd & Lipset, and also in four more rankings of geography departments only. Averaging their ordinal positions in all nine of these rankings, the seven highest-ranked geography departments, 1925-1982, were, in order, those at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Chicago, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Washington (Seattle), the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, and UCLA (Webster, 1983b, p. 136, Table 3). Six of these, all except the one at the University of Chicago, were at public universities.

The ten highest-ranked English departments, 1925-1982, are shown side by side with the ten highest-ranked institutions during the same years in Table 9 below.⁹

INSERT TABLE 9 AROUND HERE

Nine universities appear on both lists. Of the ten institutions with the highest-ranked English departments, 1925-1982, only Johns Hopkins is not on the list of highest-ranked universities, overall, during those years. It is replaced by the University of Michigan.

RAPIDLY IMPROVING AND DECLINING ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS, 1966-1982

So far, the comparisons that have been drawn have focused upon the results of the Hughes ranking and the one by NAS. A few English departments, however, have greatly improved or declined in reputational rankings in the sixteen years between the Cartter Report (1966)¹⁰ and the NAS ranking.

The English department ranked in the top 25 by NAS which improved the most between these two rankings is the one at SUNY/Buffalo. It was not even ranked among the top 51 English departments by Cartter, but was tied for 19th by Roose & Andersen (1970) and ranked 17th by the NAS. Three other English departments that improved greatly, 1966-1982, are those at the University of Virginia, Rutgers (New Brunswick), and Brown. Virginia's English department was ranked at some unspecified place between 24th and 34th by Cartter, tied for ninth in Roose & Andersen, and was third in NAS. Rutgers, which was ranked at some unspecified place between 24th and 34th by Cartter and at some unspecified place between 30th and 42nd by Roose & Andersen, was ranked 15th by the NAS. Brown's was ranked 22nd by Cartter, tied for 22nd by Roose & Andersen, and tied for 11th in NAS.

Some English departments also declined greatly between the

Cartter Report and the NAS ranking, three of them declining by five or more ordinal positions. They are shown in Table 10, below.

INSERT TABLE 10 AROUND HERE

All three of the sharply declining English departments -- those at the University of Minnesota, Indiana University, and the University of Washington (Seattle) -- are at public universities. Their declines are especially steep when they are compared to the rankings of their institutions, overall, between the Cartter Report and the NAS.¹¹ While all three universities declined from the Cartter Report to the NAS ranking, Minnesota declined from 12th to 16th, a loss of four positions, compared to the loss of 26 positions for its English department; Indiana declined from 19th to 21st, a loss of two positions, compared to seven for its English department; and the University of Washington declined from 16th to 19th, a loss of three positions, compared to five for its English department. So all three sharply declining English departments, especially the one at the University of Minnesota, declined by more places than did their institution.

The most highly-ranked Ph.D.-granting English departments in the United States, according to both Hughes and the NAS, were in private institutions. Nonetheless, of the 26 Ph.D.-granting English departments that the NAS' judges considered the most improved, 1975-'80, fully 21 (81%) of them, including four of the

five that were considered the very most improved, were at public universities, although only about 64% of the English departments they ranked were at public universities. The only five of the 26 departments considered the most improved situated at private universities were those at the University of Pennsylvania (tied for third), the University of Southern California (sixth), New York University (tied for 10th), and Cornell University and the University of Tulsa (both tied for 14th).

TOP-RANKED DEPARTMENTS, 1925-1982 -- THE DOMINANCE OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

One thing that is clear from the findings discussed above is the dominance of private institutions to public ones as the home of America's highest-ranked English departments from 1925 to 1982. Most of Hughes' highest-ranked English departments were at private institutions; most of his highly ranked departments that declined the most sharply, 1925-1982, were at public institutions; most of the top-ranked departments in the NAS ranking (1982) were at private institutions; and, not surprisingly, most of those English departments that were the most highly ranked, on average, in reputational rankings of English departments, 1925-1982, were at private institutions.

In Hughes' ranking, nine of his ten highest-ranked English departments (90%) and ten of his top twelve (83%) were at private institutions, although only six of his nine highest-ranked institutions, overall (67%) and eight of his top twelve institutions, overall (67%) were private. Of the four English

departments that outranked their overall institutions by three or more ordinal positions, three (75%) were private, and of the English departments that ranked three or more ordinal positions below their institutions as a whole, all three were public.

Those English departments that declined the most from the Hughes ranking of 1925 to the NAS ranking of 1982 were generally at public institutions. Of the five English departments that declined the most ordinal positions, 1925-1982, four (80%) were at such institutions. Of the seven of Hughes' 17 highest-ranked English departments that were at public institutions, four (57%) had declined by six positions or more by 1982. Of Hughes' ten highest-ranking English departments that were at private institutions, however, only one (10%) had declined by six places or more as of 1982.

Since English departments at private institutions fared better in Hughes' ranking than those at public insitutions, and the departments whose reputations declined the most, 1925-1982, were mostly at public institutions, it is not surprising that in the NAS ranking of 1982, the top-ranked English departments were once again mostly at private universities. Although only 36% of the 106 English departments the NAS rated were situated in private universities, in faculty reputation for scholarly quality, eight of the top ten (80%) and ten of the top 13 (77%) English departments were in private universities. Of the 12 English departments among those in the top 25 in the NAS ranking

that scored five or more standard scores above their institutions, seven (58%) were at private universities; of the three English departments among those in the top 25 that scored below their institutions, all were at public universities.

From 1925-1982, eight of the ten (80%) highest-ranking English departments, on average, in five reputational rankings were at private universities; in the discipline of geography, by contrast, only one of the seven (14%) and four of the ten (40%) highest-ranked departments, 1925-1982, were at private universities.

Although the highest-ranked English departments, 1925-1982, have generally been found in private, not public institutions, in recent decades English departments at public institutions may have started to close the gap. Of the four English departments ranked among the top 25 by the NAS that had jumped the most ordinal positions since the Cartter Report (1966), three (75%) were at public universities, and of the 26 English departments that the NAS raters considered to have improved the most in the previous five years, 81% were at public universities, even though only some 64% of the English departments the NAS ranked were at such universities.

The reasons why the nation's highest-ranked English departments, 1925-1982, have generally been located at private universities, and why departments at public institutions have apparently begun to close the gap in the last 25 years or so are topics worthy of further study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Carol Schneider of Oklahoma State University for typing many drafts of this manuscript; Linda Lawrence of Oklahoma State University for research assistance; and Michelle Cohen of the University of Pennsylvania for help with an early draft.

NOTES

¹Actually, the Ladd & Lipset ranking is not expressly limited to Ph.D.-granting departments. Rather, it asks respondents to "name the five departments nationally in your discipline that have the most distinguished faculties" (Scully, 1979, p. 10, question 61). However, since in all the fields they cover except law and medicine virtually every one of their highest-ranked departments grants the Ph.D. their rating is, for all practical purposes, one of Ph.D.-granting departments.

²Hughes' 1934 survey of 35 fields of study, including English, has been excluded because it is not really a ranking. That is, it does not list English or any other departments in order of their perceived quality. Rather, it simply divides some of the 49 English departments then granting doctorates into two groups -- eight considered "distinguished," without any distinctions made among them, and 19 considered the best of the rest, again without any distinctions made among the. We have excluded another ranking of English departments (Solmon & Astin, 1981) because it was limited to those that had not been listed among the 29 highest-ranking departments by Roose & Andersen. Finally, we have excluded Jack Gourman's several rankings, published since 1980, of the leading graduate departments of English (and other disciplines). These rankings are useless (Webster, 1984, 1985, 1986b).

³See, for example, the discussions of rankings of Ph.D.-granting sociology departments, 1965-1982 (Webster, Conrad, and Jensen, 1988); Ph.D.-granting geography departments (Koelsch,

1981; Webster, 1983b); law schools (Van Alstyne, 1982); schools and colleges of education (Schubert, 1979); and schools of library science (White, 1987).

⁴For a list showing what would have been Hughes' 25 highest-ranked institutions, overall, had he done the calculations needed to determine them, see Webster (1983a, p. 23, Table 11).

⁵The NAS ranking, instead of rating departments, as do all the other rankings considered here, actually rated programs, because some institutions had two or more programs in the same discipline. A university might, for example, have one biochemistry program in a department of biology or chemistry in its graduate school of arts and sciences and another one in its medical school. Programs that were offered in two or more departments or other organizational units of a university were, for the most part, in the biological sciences. Since each of the 106 institutions the NAS ranked in English had only one program in it, we use the term "English department," instead of "English programs," when discussing the NAS ranking.

⁶The scale that the NAS used for measuring faculty scholarly quality ranged from 0 to 5. Penn State, however, changed the scale to range from 1 to 6. In reporting scores here we use the Penn State scale.

⁷See, for example, Elton and Rodgers (1971, 1973); Elton and Rose (1972); Hagstrom (1971); and Wispe (1969).

⁸In doing the calculations, if two or more institutions were tied at any ordinal position, we counted both or all of them as ranking at the higher or highest position. That is, if in any

ranking two institutions were tied at seventh and eighth place, we counted both of them as being tied for seventh, rather than averaging the two positions they were tied at and counting their ordinal position as 7.5.

⁹In calculating the average rankings, 1925-1982, of institutions as a whole, two rankings were included, those by Hughes (1934) and by Ladd & Lipset (in Scully, 1979) in addition to the five used in calculating the rankings of English departments. For a discussion of how these "average rankings" were calculated, see Webster (1983a, pp. 21-22).

¹⁰For a discussion of whether graduate professors of English and recent recipients of doctorates in English believe that English departments ranked high in the Cartter Report actually educate their doctoral students better than do other English departments, see Allen (1968, pp. 85-86).

¹¹For the list of the 25 leading institutions, overall, in the Cartter Report, see Webster (1983a, p. 23, Table 11). For how this list was calculated, see Webster (1983a, pp. 21-22).

Table 1

Hughes' Highest-Ranked American Ph.D.-Granting Departments of English (1925)*

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Score</u>
1.	Harvard	136
2.	Columbia	107
3.	Yale	99
4.	Chicago	79
5.	Princeton	59
6.	Cornell	53
7.	Bryn Mawr	42
8.	Johns Hopkins	40
9.	Pennsylvania	37
{ 10.	Illinois	35 }
{ 10.	North Carolina	35 }
12.	Stanford	32
13.	Wisconsin	30
14.	California (Berkeley)	26
15.	Michigan	24
16.	Iowa	22
17.	Texas	13

*Hughes ranked the University of Toronto's English department as tied with the University of Texas for 17th, but since none of the other five rankings considered here covered Canadian universities, Toronto's ranking is not displayed.

Table 2

Hughes (1925) -- English Departments which Ranked Three or More Places Above
their Institution's Overall Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>English Department's Ranking</u>	<u>Institution's Ranking</u>	<u>Number of Ordinal Positions by Which English Department Ranks Higher than Institution</u>
1.	Texas	17	29	12
2.	Bryn Mawr	7	17	10
3.	Cornell	6	10	4
4.	Pennsylvania	9	12	3

Table 3

Hughes (1925) -- English Departments Ranked Three or More Places Below
their Institution's Overall Rank

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>English Department's</u> <u>Ranking</u>	<u>Institution's</u> <u>Ranking</u>	<u>Number of Ordinal</u> <u>Positions by Which</u> <u>English Department</u> <u>Ranks Lower than</u> <u>Institution</u>
1.	Wisconsin	13	5	8
2.	Michigan	15	8	7
3.	California (Berkeley)	14	9	5
4.	Chicago	4	1	3

Table 4

The 25 Highest-Ranked English Departments, by Faculty Scholarly Quality,
NAS Ranking (1982)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Standard Score</u>
1.	Yale	73
2.	U. of California (Berkeley)	71
3.	Virginia	70
4.	Harvard	69
{ 5.	Chicago	68 }
{ 5.	Columbia	68 }
{ 7.	Johns Hopkins	67 }
{ 7.	Princeton	67 }
{ 7.	Cornell	67 }
10.	Stanford	66
{ 11.	Brown	64 }
{ 11.	U. of California (Los Angeles)	64 }
{ 11.	Pennsylvania	64 }
14.	City U. of New York Graduate School	63
15.	Rutgers	62
16.	Michigan	61
{ 17.	Indiana	60 }
{ 17.	New York University	60 }
{ 17.	State U. of New York (Buffalo)	60 }
{ 17.	North Carolina	60 }
{ 17.	Northwestern	60 }
{ 17.	Wisconsin	60 }
23.	Texas	59

{ 24.	Illinois	58	}
{ 24.	Washington (Seattle)	58	}

Table 5

Institutions Whose English Departments' Standard Scores Are Five or More Above the Standard
Score of the Institution as a Whole (NAS, 1982)*

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Standard Score of</u> <u>English Department</u>	<u>Standard Score of</u> <u>Institution</u>	<u>Difference</u>
1.	Virginia	70	53	17
2.	Johns Hopkins	67	55	12
3.	Rutgers	62	51	11
4.	SUNY/Buffalo	60	50	10
{ 5.	City U. of New York Graduate School	63	54	9 }
{ 5.	Yale	73	64	9 }
7.	Brown	64	56	8
8.	Columbia	68	62	6
{ 9.	Chicago	68	63	5 }
{ 9.	Cornell	67	62	5 }
{ 9.	Indiana	60	55	5 }
{ 9.	Northwestern	60	55	5 }

*Only departments among the top 25 in faculty scholarly quality are shown in this table. That is, if a department ranked 40th in faculty scholarly quality, it would not be shown in this table no matter by how many standard scores it outranked its institution.

Table 6

English Departments that Declined Six or More Ordinal Positions between
Hughes (1925) and NAS (1982)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>1925 Ordinal</u>	<u>1982 Ordinal</u>	<u>Decline in Ordinal</u>
		<u>Position</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Positions</u>
1.	Bryn Mawr	7	83(T)*	-76
2.	Illinois	10(T)	24(T)	-14
3.	Iowa	16	26(T)	-10
4.	North Carolina	10(T)	17(T)	- 7
5.	Texas	17	23	- 6

*T stands for tied with one or more institutions at that position.

Table 7

Rankings of English Departments in Six Reputational Rankings, 1925-1982

	<u>Hughes</u> (1925)	<u>Keniston</u> (1959)	<u>Cartter</u> (1966)	<u>Roose &</u> <u>Andersen</u> (1970)	<u>Ladd &</u> <u>Lipset</u> (1979)	<u>NAS**</u> (1982)
Harvard	1	1	2	2*	2	4
Columbia	2	3	5	6*	9	5*
Yale	3	2	1	1	1	1
Chicago	4	8	6	4*	4	5*
Princeton	5	5	4	4*	5	7*
Cornell	6	9*	8	9*		7*
Bryn Mawr	7					
Johns Hopkins	8	9*	11*	8	8	7*
Pennsylvania	9	12	18	17*		11*
Illinois	10	11	11	12*		24*
North Carolina	11		17	12*	11	17*
Stanford	12	15	7	6*	6	10
Wisconsin	13	6	9	11		17*
U. of California (Berkeley)	14	4	3	2*	3	2
Michigan	15	7	13	17*	10	16
Iowa	16			22*		

Texas	17	23	25*	23
Indiana	13	10	12*	17*
U. of California (Los Angeles)	14	14	12*	11*
Minnesota	16	15	29	
Northwestern		16	19*	17*
Virginia			9*	7 3
Washington (Seattle)		19	12*	24*
Brown		22	22*	11*
City U. of New York Graduate School				14
Rutgers		15		
Duke		20	22*	
New York University		21	19*	17*
SUNY/Buffalo			19*	17*
Brandeis			25*	
Claremont Graduate School			25*	
Rochester			25*	

*Stands for two or more institutions tied at the same position,

**The positions for the NAS ranking are based on English departments' standard scores, not their mean scores.

Table 8

The Leading Ph.D.-Granting Departments of English in Average Reputational
Ranking, 1925-1982

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Average Ranking</u>
1.	Yale	1.6
2.	Harvard	2
3.	Columbia	4.2
{ 4.	California (Berkeley)	5 }
4.	Princeton	5
6.	Chicago	5.4
7.	Cornell	7.8
8.	Johns Hopkins	8.6
9.	Stanford	10
10.	Wisconsin	11.2

Table 9

The Highest-Ranked English Departments, 1925-1982 and the
Highest-Ranked Institutions, Overall, 1925-1982

<u>Rank</u>	<u>English Departments*</u>	<u>Institutions**</u>
1.	Yale	Harvard
2.	Harvard	California (Berkeley)
3.	Columbia	Yale
{ 4.	California (Berkeley)	Chicago }
{ 4.	Princeton	Wisconsin }
6.	Chicago	Michigan
7.	Cornell	Columbia
8.	Johns Hopkins	Stanford
9.	Stanford	Princeton
10.	Wisconsin	Cornell

*Based on Hughes (1925); Keniston (1959); Cartter (1966); Roose & Andersen (1970); and NAS (1982).

**Based on Hughes (1925); Hughes (1934); Keniston (1959); Cartter (1966); Roose & Andersen (1970); Ladd & Lipset (1979); and NAS (1982).

Table 10

English Departments that Declined Five or More Ordinal Positions, 1966-1982

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>English</u> <u>Department's</u> <u>Rank (1966)</u>	<u>English</u> <u>Department's</u> <u>Rank (1982)</u>	<u>Difference</u>
1.	Minnesota	15	41(T)*	-26
2.	Indiana	10	17(T)	- 7
3.	Washington (Seattle)	19	24(T)	- 5

*T stands for two or more institutions tied at this position.

REFERENCES

Allen, Don Cameron. (1968). The Ph.D. in English and American Literature. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Astin, Alexander W. (1985). Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cartter, Allan M. (1966). An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Elton, Charles F. and Rodgers, Samuel A. (1971). Physics department ratings: another evaluation. Science 174 (November 5): 565-568.

Elton, Charles F. and Rodgers, Sam A. (1973). The department rating game: measure of quantity or quality? Higher Education 2(4): 439-446.

Elton, Charles F. and Rose, Harriet A. (1972). What are the ratings rating? American Psychologist 27(3): 197-201.

Hagstrom, Warren O. (1971). Inputs, outputs, and the prestige of university science departments. Sociology of Education 44(4): 375-397.

- Hughes, R.M. (1925). A Study of the Graduate Schools of America. Oxford, Ohio: Miami University Press.
- Hughes, R.M. (1934). Report of the committee on graduate instruction. Educational Record 15(April): 192-234.
- Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. (1977). The Academic Revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, Lyle V., Lindzey, Gardner, and Coggeshall, Porter E. (ed.). (1982). An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Keniston, Hayward. (1959). Graduate Study and Research in the Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Koelsch, William A. (1981). 'Better than thou': the rating of geography departments in the United States, 1924-1980. Journal of Geography 80(5): 164-169.
- Ladd, Jr., Everett C. and Lipset, Seymour Martin. (1977). The 1977 Survey of the American Professoriate. Mimeographed. No place.

Roose, Kenneth D. and Andersen, Charles J. (1970). A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Schubert, William H. (1979). Contributions to AERA annual programs as an indicator of institutional productivity. Educational Researcher 8(7): 13-19.

Scully, Malcolm G. (1979). The well-known universities lead in faculties' reputations. Chronicle of Higher Education 19 (January 15): 6-7.

Solmon, Lewis C. and Astin, Alexander W. (1981). Departments without distinguished graduate programs. Change 13(6): 23-28.

Trow, Martin A. (1984). Analysis of status. In Burton R. Clark (ed.). Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Van Alstyne, Scott. (1982). Ranking the law schools: the reality of illusion? American Bar Foundation Journal 7(summer): 649-684.

Webster, David S. (1983a). America's highest ranked graduate schools, 1925-1982. Change 15(4): 14-24.

- Webster, David S. (1983b). The highest ranked American Ph.D. granting geography departments: 1925-1982. Directions 25-26(1): 125-143.
- Webster, David S. (1984). Who is Jack Gourman and why is he saying all those things about my college? Change 16(8): 14-19; 45-56.
- Webster, David S. (1985). How not to rank universities. Higher Education 4(1): 101-109.
- Webster, David S. (1986a). Academic Quality Rankings of American Colleges and Universities. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Webster, David S. (1986b). Jack Gourman's rankings of colleges and universities: a guide for the perplexed. RQ 25(3): 323-331.
- Webster, David S., Conrad, Clifton F., and Jensen, Eric L. (1988). Objective and reputational rankings of Ph.D.-granting departments of sociology, 1965-1982. Sociological Focus 21(2): 177-198.

White, Herbert S. (1987). Perceptions by educators and administrators of the ranking of library school programs: an update and analysis. Library Quarterly 57(3): 252-268.

Wispé, Lauren G. (1969). The bigger the better: productivity, size, and turnover in a sample of psychology departments. American Psychologist 24(7): 662-668.